<center>REMARKS</center>

Claims 1-6, 10-19 and 22-25 were pending in the application prior to this amendment. At least in light of the above amendments and the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

<center>*Specification*</center>

By way of the foregoing amendment, Applicant hereby completes the serial number of the patent application referenced in the instant specification.

<center>*Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103*</center>

Claims 1-3, 10-12, 16-18 and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) on the basis of being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,029,140 (Martin, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,822,410 (McCausland, et al.).

Claim 1 has been amended. Applicant claims an apparatus to monitor a workflow process to detect one or more exceptions that disrupt completion of one or more purchasing transactions between transactional parties. When the detected exceptions correspond to a first type, the apparatus automatically resolves the disruption without communicating with the transactional parties. When the detected exceptions correspond to a second type, the apparatus causes an outbound communication to be sent to a purchasing one of the transactional parties proactively and independently of whether the purchasing transactional party has reported the disruption. When the detected exceptions correspond to a third type, the apparatus establishes a real time collaboration session between the transactional parties proactively and independently of whether the transactional parties have reported the disruption. *See* the present specification, at least page 15, lines 3-10.

Martin discloses a computer system for setting product delivery dates. *See* Abstract. The customer requests a delivery date, and when that requested delivery date cannot be met, the computer system presents a human order scheduler with certain information that helps the human order scheduler manually select a later date. *See* col. 3, lines 65-67. Namely, the computer system is programmed to show the human order

scheduler information from a customer preferences database 12 and a sales order database 20 and waits for a selection from the human order scheduler. There is no disclosure that the human order scheduler uses any information other than the information from the two databases 12 and 20 when making the manual selection. Even if Martin did disclose the computer system causing an outbound communication to be sent to a purchasing transactional parties proactively and independently of whether the purchasing transactional party has reported the disruption (which it does not), the computer system does not determine whether the detected exceptions correspond to a first type, a second type or a third type according to characteristics of the detected exceptions.

McCausland discloses system 20 that resolves churn, which is bureaucratic inefficiency caused by dissatisfied customers deactivating their accounts. *See* Abstract, and col. 1, lines 10-11 and FIG. 1. The system 20 monitors customer activity and outputs statistics based on 1) how vulnerable the customer base is, 2) how much the customer is worth, and 3) numerous other factors shown in TABLE 1 including how many dropped calls the customer has suffered, how overdue the customers account is, etc. *See* FIG. 3. These outputted statistics are used by a customer save team to call the customer before the customer causes churn (e.g. before the customer requests deactivation of their account). Even if *potential*, yet to occur churn were a detected exception presenting disrupting a transaction (which it is not), the system 20 does not determine whether the potential churn corresponds to a first type, a second type or a third type according to characteristics of the potential churn.

In contrast, claim 1 includes an apparatus to determine whether the detected exceptions correspond to a first type, a second type or a third type according to characteristics of the detected exceptions. This feature allows the apparatus to respond appropriately and proactively with minimal manual involvement. Thus, claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 2-3 are dependant and should also be allowed. The remaining claims 10-12, 16-18 and 22-24 should be allowed for at least similar reasons as claims 1-3.

Claims 4, 13, 19 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) on the basis of being unpatentable over Martin, et al., in view of McCausland, et al. and further in view of Official Notice.

Claims 4, 13, 19 and 25 are dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Claims 5, 6, 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, et al., in view of McCausland, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,530,518 (Krichilsky, et al.).

Claims 5, 6, 14 and 15 are dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Amendments To The Existing Claims

Support for all the amendments to the claims can be found in the present specification. With respect to claims 2 and 13, see at least page 13, lines 4-25. With respect to claim 3, see page 15, lines 9-10. With respect to claim 4, see at least page 13, lines 13-25. With respect to claim 5, see at least page 13, lines 13-14. With respect to claim 6, see at least page 12, lines 12-25. With respect to claim 11, see at least page 15, lines 18-25. With respect to claim 12, see at least page 14, lines 12-14. With respect to claim 19, see at least page 19, lines 10-22. The amended claims not specifically mentioned above are support at least by page 5, lines 3-25 and page 6, lines 1-4.

New Claims

New claims 27-30 have been added. *See* the present specification, at least page 9, lines 5-7 and page 15, lines 3-10.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 503-222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575   Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

_____
Michael A. Cofield
Reg. No. 54,630

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613